

## **BPAC Meeting Minutes 6/28/07**

Staff – Sandy, Rich, Diana, Tom  
Guests - Al Meckler,

7:38 pm called to order

Cathy Baylock first Marc Hershman second for approval of the minutes

Ken Ibarra abstained from vote

2. none
3. Minutes approval passed
4. Measure A

Joe Hurley presented this item. As per the public request for more bike ped projects.

35 dedicated to bike/ped 45 million or 1.8 million per year, doubling the amount available per year.

Looking at it from a programmatic perspective he wanted feedback from BPAC to take back to make a recommendation as far as adoption into the strategic plan.

Looking to make it equitable.

50% XX  
50% competition

Leveraging funds: Try to leverage as much as possible. Could require that the Measure A money only be available for construction.

Is that appropriate? Money goes further and project sponsors have more vested interest since they spend money up front.

Specific criteria? Same as that BPAC/CMA uses, same as MTC, does this generate the best projects for the County?

This would be distributed based purely on population. To be used on specific purposes and would include a yearly audit.

The timely use of funds will be a key component. Project readiness.

Bike and Pedestrian split – should there be one?

Should maintenance be an eligible expense?

Measure A funds cannot be used to replace an existing funding source. Also need to make sure that transit becomes a more appealing mode of transportation, improved access to transit centers.

Comments:

Member Baylock – Criteria that we use in the scoring program would take care of????

Maintenance – may fall under major project anyway as they have before and would be eligible.

Hershman – Knowing that we have 1.8 million available may be nice since we will have the opportunity to fund some big projects. Maybe we should keep it together to have some big projects.

Alfano- agreed w/ member Hershman, there are some big projects that could be funded. The 50/50 split could be used as maintenance of the projects that have been funded.

BPAC agreed that the split idea is not good. They liked having the larger chunk of money that would be competitive.

Joe Hurley – how would we deal with the geographic equity issue?

In the past the BPAC has dealt with that through the competitive process. Smaller dollar amounts have been a problem in the past. Too small amounts do not end up getting used, and are more difficult to administer.

Harding – Would like to endorse the idea of funding multi year groups in order to have money available to fund larger projects and not have to do partial funding.

Alfano – Brisbane great project but had to be partially funded. Smaller projects that scored well last time in TDA round did not get funded since there was not enough money due to really high scoring large projects.

Two year cycle seems to be the recommended idea since there would be a 3.6 million dollar pot of money available.

Maintenance is on the table per the BPAC. The money should be used for construction.

It might be a good idea to set aside money for planning. How much for design? Joe wants to have criteria and get away from making decisions on a case by case basis.

If we only do construction then the applicants have to be serious about the projects. The scoring is currently geared for construction.

When there is money provided as the match then there is more commitment.

Perhaps the scoring criteria should be looked at to make sure that planning projects can be funded.

Time limits are a good item to make sure that the money does not get tied up and not used.

Cities/County are generally the sponsors and SamTrans should be eligible too. BPAC is comfortable with the current criteria, amount of funding has been the issue that has occurred in the past.

There should be flexibility with planning projects, not a set aside percentage of money for planning projects. Perhaps the criteria should be evaluated to address planning projects. This could be an item for further discussion.

## 5. Discussion on Bicycle Route Network and Facilities

Cronin – Looking for a way for applicants to apply for less glamorous but useful. Maintenance may be brought in through Measure A. BPAC could notify the Cities that we could fund maintenance projects. In certain cities it is difficult to get through due to the fact that bikes are required to run red lights. There are issues with the fact that many of the signals are controlled by Caltrans and the loop detectors do not operate properly. There are issues with both the sensitivity as well as the location of the loop. Perhaps they could be adjusted through the control box or they could stencil the loop detectors so that bicyclist could

Alfano – we could add something to the letter that goes out for TDA, for Cities to look at their facilities to see if there are any current issues with facilities.

Cronin – There should be attention paid to the network of bike lanes instead of larger projects, the

There could be more emphasis on the improving connectivity and bridging gaps in the network.

Meadows – Could we have the public safety groups help push for the maintenance of the existing loop detectors, etc.

We should entice or encourage the smaller projects. These are mainly maintenance issues. BPAC could encourage the maintenance type projects as they could be funded through TDA 3.

Perhaps BPAC could welcome other BPAC's to come and talk to us about their concerns and issues that they are dealing with which would help foster dialogue.

We could send a letter to BPACS requesting them to discuss their concerns with us. Naomi thought that this could put the advisory members from other communities in an awkward position.

Alfano motion – To ask staff to prepare a letter to encourage cities to evaluate existing facilities (bike/ped) for functionality and ask them to maintain them. Also make them aware of Measure A funding to consider larger scale maintenance funding and understand that maintenance projects are eligible. They could aggregate facilities upgrade projects that could no longer be maintained.

Amended by member Barnes to include - Cities should be reminded that if they submit maintenance projects those would count toward their three project limit.

Second – Lancelle

Motion carried unanimously

### **Sandy Wong presented item 6. TDA Review**

There was some concern that ADA ramps type projects for TDA Article 3.

Some cities set aside general funds to take care of these ADA needs, other do not have the funds.

Planning projects that were really good but the BPAC could not score them well based on the scoring criteria.

Meadows – if we open up planning projects it could be difficult to create a separate set of scoring and planning projects and we could fund planning projects that do not actually bring forward construction projects.????????? Check Tapes

Member Lancelle - If we do have planning funding set aside it should be a small number like 10%.

The scoring criteria will need to be revised to include scoring criteria to reflect planning projects. This will need to be an agenda item in the future to have a proper discussion.

There could be punitive measures for funding planning projects if they do not bring forward projects that end up being endorsed by their community.

Baylock – The City should have to bring forward a plan to be eligible. The city needs to do the planning work first.

The current scoring criteria is geared for construction. If we are to fund planning projects there should be a separate scoring criteria for “planning projects”.

**Item 7. Recommendation on the Bike Map RFP Shu presented this item.**

The Bike Map Subcommittee would like to have the existing routes checked as well as to define the Class I, 2, 3.

By the Bike Map Subcommittee, the data is to be collected by August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007. Then this data will be placed into the GIS layer.

Chevrons are to be used instead of colors to show gradient. The routes should be shown in a more visible color such as red.

The assignment is to return by the next meeting a copy of the validation maps by cities.

Motion by Alfano – Move to extend the process to the next meeting at which point the members should come back with validated versions of the map so that the subcommittee could have a route layer that could be provided to the approved bidder for the RFP.

Second by Barnes

Motion carried unanimously

Motion to adjourn Alfano

Second by Lancelle

Adjourned at 9:55